UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,883	09/29/2000	Nobuaki Takishita	JP919990091 US1	9224

7590   05/03/2004

Anne Vachon Dougherty
3173 Cedar Road
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004   5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/675,883	TAKISHITA, NOBUAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 March 2004*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6 and 8-16* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6 and 8-16* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 2 and 7 are canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on paper no. 4, with respect to claims 1, 3-6, 8-16 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,161,113 by Mora et al. in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,504,889 by Burgess.

Claims 3, 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,161,113 by Mora et al. in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,504,889 by Burgess in further view of U. S. Patent No. 6,072,490 by Bates.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,161,113 by Mora et al in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,504,889 by Burgess in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325 by Reed et al.

Claims 8, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,161,113 by Mora et al in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,504,889 by Burgess in further view of U.S Patent No 6,230,185 by Salas et al

Regarding claim 1,

The Mora reference teaches status indication being viewable by said plurality of users of the groupware (Mora: col. 1, lines 36-44, groupware; col. 1, lines 47-60).

The Mora reference teaches status of documents but not accessed status.

The Burgess reference teaches a system of indicating user status for at least a plurality of users (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-24), said user status indicating whether said user has accessed at least one document for users (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-24) and provides a status indication indicating the user status in a displayed status row bar (Burgess: col. 1, lines 33-43; col. 5, lines 60-66).

The Burgess reference further teaches this robust and efficient system (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-15) overcomes the problem of users relying on their memory to determine which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of groupware as taught by Mora while indicating user status as taught by Burgess to overcome the need to for users to remember which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Claim 4 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Burgess and Mora et al.

Regarding claim 4, the method according to claim 1, wherein when the documents are divided into document groups (Burgess: col. 7, lines 15-31; Mora: col. 1, lines 39-41), each of which consists of a plurality of documents (Burgess: Abstract), said method further comprising displaying a document group status indication (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-20) showing whether at least one of the documents in each document group has not been read for each document group (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-20; col. 5, lines 60-66).

Regarding claim 6,

The Mora reference teaches an apparatus of groupware (Mora: col. 1, lines 36-44), said apparatus comprising:

a server (Mora: Figure 1, tag 11) connected to a network (Mora: col. 3, lines 22-29) comprising a status database (Mora: col. 5, lines 15-25); and

at least one display device for displaying said user status indication (Mora: col. 4, lines 2-8).

The Mora reference teaches status of documents but not accessed status.

The Burgess reference teaches a method of indicating a user status regarding access to at least one document (Burgess: col. 5, lines 60-66), said user status indicating whether said user has accessed at least one document (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-25) and a status determining component for determining user status (Burgess: col. 1, lines 33-43).

The Burgess reference further teaches this robust and efficient system (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-15) overcomes the problem of users relying on their memory to determine which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the apparatus of server running groupware as taught by Mora while employing indicating user status as taught by Burgess to overcome the need to for users to remember which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Burgess and Mora.

Regarding claim 14, the apparatus of claim 6, wherein when the documents are divided into document groups (Burgess: col. 7, lines 15-31; Mora: col. 1, lines 39-41), each of which consists of a plurality of documents (Burgess: Abstract), said method further comprising displaying a document group status indication showing whether at least one of the documents in each document group has not been read for each document group (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-20; col. 5, lines 60-66).

Regarding claim 15, the apparatus of claim 6 further comprising a manager operation section (Mora: col. 5, lines 44-55) connected to said network and comprising a manager input device and a manager screen (Mora: col. 3, lines 60 – col. 4, lines 8).

Regarding claim 16, the apparatus according to claim 6 further comprising a user operation section (Mora: col. 3, lines 53-59) connected to said network and including at least one user screen and at least one user input device (Mora: col. 3, lines 60 – col. 4, lines 8).

Regarding claim 10,

The Mora reference teaches a program storage device readable by machine (Mora: col. 3, lines 60-67) for at least one of a plurality of users of groupware (Mora: col. 1, lines 36-44) that displays a status indication being viewable by said plurality of users of the groupware (col. 1, lines 47-60).

The Mora reference teaches status of documents but not accessed status.

The Burgess reference teaches providing status indication indicating the user status in said displayed status row bar (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-25; col. 5, lines 60-66) in a program storage device through a tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for indicating user status (Burgess: col. 1, lines 25-27).

The Burgess reference further teaches this robust and efficient system (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-15) overcomes the problem of users relying on their memory to determine which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of groupware as taught by Mora while indicating user status as taught by Burgess to overcome the need to for users to remember which files they have read (Burgess: col. 1, lines 19-21).

Regarding claim 5,

The Burgess and Mora references teach a system of indicating user status in groupware.

The Burgess and Mora references do not explicitly state the use of colors or patterns in displaying user status.

The Bates reference teaches displaying status indication provided by colors or patterns (Bates: col. 10, lines 38-45) in a method of displaying and linking nodes of individual records (Bates: col. 53-57).

The Bates reference further teaches display elements can display the retrieve status easily and quickly (Bates: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of indicating user status in groupware as taught by Burgess and Mora while using colors or patterns as taught by Bates in order to display the status easily and quickly (Bates: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 3, the method according to claim 1, wherein when the users are divided into groups (Mora: col. 5, lines 50-55), said status indication shows what percentage of the users of each group have read each document for each group (Burgess: col. 2, lines 12-15; Bates: col. 12, lines 63-64).

Regarding claim 13,

The Burgess and Mora references teach a system of indicating user status in groupware, where users are divided into groups (Mora: col. 5, lines 50-55).

The Burgess and Mora references do not explicitly state a percentage associated with users who have accessed.

The Bates reference teaches a map display that indicates a percentage complete variable (Bates: col. 12, lines 63-64).

The Bates reference further teaches display elements can display the retrieve status easily and quickly (Bates: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of indicating user status in groupware as taught by Burgess and Mora while using a percentage value as taught by Bates in order to display the status easily and quickly (Bates: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 11,

The Mora and Burgess references teach the method of claim 1 with user status among groups of users and documents.

The Mora and Burgess references do not explicit disclose user status indicate, "not read" when a user has changed a document.

The Salas reference teaches wherein user status indicates whether a user has changed a document (Salas: col. 5, lines 43-49).

The Salas reference further teaches the system allows user to perform work on files and objects locally and upload them to the server for viewing, comment, or further modification by other project team members (Salas: col. 12, lines 31-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of indicating user status in groupware as taught by Burgess and Mora while indicating whether a user has changed a document as taught by Salas in order to allow other project team members to view, comment, or further modify the file (Salas: col. 12, lines 31-37).

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Tada et al and Burgess, Mora and Salas.

Regarding claim 12, the method according to claim 11, wherein when a user changes a document, the status indication for the other of the said plurality of users is automatically updated to "not read" (Salas: col. 5, lines 43-49).

Regarding claim 8,

The Mora and Burgess references teach the apparatus of claim 6 with a status update component (Burgess: col. 6, lines 15-22; Figure 9) that updates user status among groups of users and documents.

The Mora and Burgess references do not explicit disclose user status indicate, "not read" when a user has changed a document.

The Salas reference teaches wherein user status indicates whether a user has changed a document (Salas: col. 5, lines 43-49).

The Salas reference further teaches the system allows user to perform work on files and objects locally and upload them to the server for viewing, comment, or further modification by other project team members (Salas: col. 12, lines 31-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of indicating user status in groupware as taught by Burgess and Mora while indicating whether a changed document has been read as taught by Salas in order to allow other project team members to view, comment, or further modify the file (Salas: col. 12, lines 31-37).

Regarding claim 9,

The Burgess, and Mora references teach an apparatus of indicating user status in a groupware.

The Burgess, and Mora references disclose using email but do not explicitly state the use of email to notify of updated or cached out files.

The Reed reference teaches the apparatus according to claim 7, further comprising a mail generation component from which a mail is sent to members of a specific group who have not read the document (Reed: col. 133, lines 50-53; lines 24-34).

The Reed reference further teaches that the use of the communications object does not require any special server program or complex configuration and it can employ notification control to allow every member of the list to filter messages (Reed: col. 133, lines 53-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create an apparatus of indicating user status in a groupware environment with manager and user interfaces as taught by Burgess and Mora while employing a email notification tool as taught by Reed in order to notify users of new or updated data without a complicated configuration or special server program and allowing the users of the list to filter messages (Reed: col. 133, lines 53-56).

The Applicant Argues:

With respect to claim 1, Applicant disagrees that the Burgess reference teaches user status. Applicant argues Burgess teaches document status to only one user instead of user status. Moreover, Burgess does not provide document status for a plurality of groupware.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Burgess reference does teach user status (col. 2, lines 12-25) with respect to files that have or have not been read by the user. The user status as applied to the files through the bitmap show if the user has read the files. If the reference was only concerned with document status, then the steps in col. 2, lines 23-33, would not be necessary to determine if the files have been read by the user (emphasis added). Moreover, the Burgess reference does teach a plurality of users (col. 4, lines 58). The broad diction of the claims fail to describe or teach user status as

applicant is arguing. Burgess does not singly teach this status for a plurality of groupware but the

combination of Burgess and Mora do.

With respect to claims 1 and 3, Applicant argues that the Tada reference does not teach

"a system wherein at least one of a plurality of users is of groupware."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Applicant cites the specification to define groupware as cited in the claims. Applicant is

advised to further define the terms in claims to reduce broad interpretations. In light of the

amended claim, the reference U.S. Patent No 6,161,113 by Mora et al is added to the claim

rejection, which meets the limitation in dispute.

With respect to claim 9, Applicant argues the combination of Burgess and Tada and

Reed.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references,

the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, the Reed reference further teaches that the use of the communications object

does not require any special server program or complex configuration and it can employ

notification control to allow every member of the list to filter messages (Reed: col. 133, lines 53-

56).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb
April 28, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
'ERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER